

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

 Compare Note
 Compare Note<

Attn: Mark J. Gebhardt MUETING, RAASCH & GEBHARDT, P.A. P.O. Box 581415 Minneapolis, MN 55458-1415 + NAMING +

DANG, PHUC I

ARICANI BARER NUMBER

DATE MAILED Small 2003

Please find below and or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/042 025	DERDERIAN ET AL
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	PHUC T DANG	2818
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	with the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 1.7 CFF after SIX. 6. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above its less than thirty (30 days as 1 NO period for reply is specified above the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will be stored. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meaned catent term adjustment. See 31 CFR 1 T04 b.	N Rin 138 all Thindlevent inclweven may a red y within the statutory in himum of thi red y will apply and will expire SIX 6 Mo at the loadise the application to hercome A	ifacilibetime (fiet) d, 30 days will be considered time (NTHS from the mailing bate of this communication PANDONE (1841) sign is that
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on a	amendment filed on February	<u>. 13, 2003</u>
2a) This action is FINAL . 2bi €	This action is non-final	
Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und Disposition of Claims	owance except for formal ma der <i>Ex parte Quayle.</i> 1935 C	atters prosecution as to the merits is D 11, 453 O G 213
4) Claim(s) 30-40 is/are pending in the application	ation	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	drawn from consideration	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) <u>30-40</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the E≺am	iner	
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 October 2002</u> is/a	re: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ obje	cted to by the Examiner
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) approved b) c	disapproved by the Examiner
if approved, corrected drawings are required in	• •	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U S C	§ 119(a)-(d) cr (f)
a) All b) Some * c) None of		
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in A	pplication No
 Copies of the certified copies of the piants application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for a little 	Bureau (PCT Rule 17 2(a)).	•
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application)
a: ☐ The translation of the foreign language p 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome		
Attachment(s)	•	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-348) Information Disclosure Statement,s (PTO-1449) Pacer Nois	4	Summary PTO-413 Paper No.s nformal Patent Application (PTO-150

Application/Control Number: 10/042.025

Art Unit: 2818

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath declaration filed on October 25, 2001 is acceptable.

Specification

3. The specification has been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. However, the applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

* Application/Control Number: 10/042.025

Art Unit: 2818

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 30-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hooykaas (U.S. Patent No. 4,953,989).

Hooykaas discloses a conductive structure comprising at least a rough ruthenium layer, wherein a surface of the rough ruthenium layer or the rough ruthenium oxide has a surface area greater than a surface area of a completely smooth surface [col. 4, lines 64-col. 5, lines 8].

Hooykaas discloses all the features of the claimed invention as discussed above, but does not disclose the surface of the rough ruthenium layer has a surface area greater than about 1.2 times a surface area of a completely smooth surface having a substantially identical shape as the surface of the rough ruthenium layer.

Using a ratio of the surface of the rough ruthenium layer has a surface area greater than about 1.2 times a surface area of a completely smooth surface having a substantially identical shape as the surface of the rough ruthenium layer is considered to be obvious in variation design, since the ratio between the rough surface and smooth surface of the ruthenium is well known in the art, thus would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the appropriate ratio such as 1. 2 times between a rough and smooth surface of the ruthenium for a purpose of increasing the surface of the lower electrode.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuc T. Dang whose telephone number is 703-305-1080. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am-5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2818

- If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David C. Nelms can be reached on 703-308-4910. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-5841 for After Final communications.
- Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Phue T. Dang P. 77 Torget Rev

Examiner

Art Unit 2818

May 30, 2003